




**Dear Zenab Haji Ismail, case officer,**

**There still remains Essential Living's application to amend condition number 27: which states: "details of proposed u-values and the approach to thermal bridging shall be submitted to and approved".**

**I strongly object to approval of this being granted.**

**Yours sincerely,**

Chris Tarpey



re Application 2016/1321/P

Dear Zenab Haji Ismail

I cannot believe that I am having to write to you again to complain about an early application from EL to amend yet another condition in order to begin demolishing 100 Avenue Road before all of the SoS's conditions have been met in full.

But, here I go again - jumping through yet more hoops.

Please take this before whatever powers that be are concerned:

**I strongly object to approval being granted to Essential Living's application to amend condition number 27: which states: "details of proposed u-values and the approach to thermal bridging shall be submitted to and approved".**

Yours sincerely

Edie Raff

9c Lawn Road  
London  
NW3 2XS

12<sup>th</sup> April 2016

Zenab Haji-Ismail  
Development Control  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 8ND

Dear Sir/Madam

**100 AVENUE ROAD LONDON NW3 – AMENDMENT OF CONDITION NO 27  
–APPLICATION NO 2016/2048/P**

I write to lodge objections to the new application submitted by Essential Living to vary condition 27 of the conditions in planning application no. 2014/1617/P.

In view of the serious concerns of London Transport I object to the rephrasing of the condition to excuse demolition of the building.

The Inspector went into great detail regarding the imposition of conditions, notwithstanding the very serious environmental concerns of objectors raised at the public inquiry, and the lack of a full EIA assessment in this particular case.

Demolition prior to the grant of full planning permission could also have similar environmental effects giving rise to concerns in the same way as carrying out the implementation of the current scheme.

I would therefore urge that this application be refused, and it is noted that Essential Living have withdrawn their previous application, no. 2016/1321/P, and it is therefore presumed that this was totally misconceived and an abuse of the planning system by Essential Living.


I would also consider the present application to be equally an abuse of the planning system, and can see no valid grounds why all of the safeguards imposed by the Inspector shouldn't be adhered to in this case. It would appear that Essential Living are trying to obtain special favourable status for themselves at the expense of the community, like their main scheme.

I would therefore invite you to refuse the current application accordingly.

Yours faithfully



**Terence Ewing**



**Re: 100 AVENUE ROAD LONDON NW3 – AMENDMENT OF CONDITION NO 27 –  
APPLICATION NO 2016/2048/P**

Dear Zenab

Thank you, for talking with me earlier today.

I object to the new application submitted by Essential Living to vary condition 27 of the conditions in planning application no. 2014/1617/P.

Whilst I appreciate your assurances that no demolition can go ahead in any case until TfL and Camden have approved the developers detailed foundation plans, and that other conditions requiring detailed plans must be satisfied, all of which may take some time, it baffles me even more so, then, that the developers application to amend condition 27 can still be considered in this light.


I sincerely hope that this consultation can be the last one that is needed to challenge any more attempts by the developers to demolish early & thereby implement planning permissions.

Regards

---

**Janine Sachs**





12th Apr. 2016.

Dear Zenab Haji Ismail, case officer,

There still remains Essential Living's application to amend condition number 27: which states: "details of proposed u-values and the approach to thermal bridging shall be submitted to and approved".

I strongly object to approval of this being granted.

Yours sincerely,

Elaine Chambers

p.s. please acknowledge that you have received this email. Thank you.